

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 1-4. These sheets, which include Figures 1-4, replace the original sheets including Figures 1-4. In Figures 1-4, the wording “Prior Art” has been added.

Attachment: 4 Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 1-33 are pending. No new matter has been added. Replacement drawing sheets have been submitted. The specification has been amended for clerical reasons.

Drawings

Figures 1-4

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Figures 1-4 as being prior art, and not being labeled as such. Applicant has amended Figures 1-4 herein and includes the replacement sheets herewith. Therefore, the objection with respect to Figures 1-4 is moot.

Figures 1-5 and 7-8

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Figures 1-5 and 7-8 as being informal. On March 8, 2004, Formal Substitute Drawings (10 sheets) were mailed to the USPTO, and Applicant respectfully states that formal drawings for all figures have already been submitted. Therefore, the objection with respect to Figures 1-5 and 7-8 is moot.

Specification

Title of the Invention

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the title as not being descriptive of the invention. Applicant respectfully asserts that the title, “Methods and Systems for Dynamically Configuring a Network Component” is descriptive of the invention, and appears to the Applicant to be within the standards provided by the MPEP.

Page 10, Second Paragraph, Lines 6-14

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to page 10, second paragraph, lines 6-14 due to informalities concerning the use of trademarks. Applicant has amended page 10, second paragraph, lines 6-14 accordingly by capitalizing the trademark used therein. Therefore, the objection with respect to page 10, second paragraph, lines 6-14 is moot.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by McCanne (U.S. Patent No. 6,785,704) (hereinafter, McCanne). The Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the present invention as recited in Claims 1-33 is not anticipated by McCanne. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following rationale.

CLAIM 1

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 1 which recites:

A method for dynamically configuring a network component, comprising:
receiving a request for content from a first network connected component;
determining a type of media service needed for at least a portion of said content; and
configuring a data relaying component to forward said at least a portion of said content
from a second network connected component to a third network connected component to receive
said type of media service.

Emphasis added.

Independent Claims 12 and 23 recite features similar to those of independent Claim 1.

According to the Federal Circuit, “anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each claim under consideration”. W.L. Gore & Assocs. V. Garlock Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

McCanne does not anticipate a method for dynamically configuring a network component that includes “configuring a data relaying component to forward said at least a portion of said content from a second network connected component to a third network connected component to receive said type of media service”. (emphasis added) as is recited in Applicant’s Claim 1. Applicant understands McCanne to disclose a method “for providing content to a client”. McCanne, ABSTRACT. Furthermore, McCanne’s Figures 5 and 6 clearly show a request received from a client, and content provided to the client in response to this request.

In contrast, Applicant’s Claim 1 includes the feature, “receiving a request for content from a first network component”, and forwarding “said at least a portion of said content ...to a third network connected component”. Emphasis added. Thus, Applicant’s invention discloses a third network connected component receiving content in response to a first network component requesting content.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that McCanne does not anticipate the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 1, 12, and 23, and as such, Claims 1, 12, and 23 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that McCanne does not anticipate the present claimed invention as is recited in Claims 2-12 dependent on Claim 1, 13-22 dependent on Claim 12, and Claims 24-33 dependent on Claim 23 overcome the Examiner's basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above-listed remarks and amendments, the Applicant respectfully request allowance of the Claims 1-33.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER BLECHER LLP

Date: 12/07/2007

John P. Wagner
Reg. No. 35,398
123 Westridge Dr.
Watsonville, CA 95076
408-377-0500